

REMARKS

In the subject Office Action, the examiner rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 USC 103(a) for obviousness over Bradley et al '071 in view of Hayakawa '993. Applicants request reconsideration of their application in view of this response which amends Claim 1, adds new Claims 6-7, and provides argument supporting allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicants previously pointed out, Bradley et al. shows a mirror on a shaft that is rotationally (not linearly) displaced to change a view presented to an imaging device. Hayakawa shows an axially displaceable mirror (Fig. 2) for shifting the position of a single image; see, for example, column 9, lines 18-30. Displacing the mirror 14 with motor 25 moves an image – it does not present a different view to an imaging device as stated by the examiner. Therefore, the teachings of Hayakawa would not make it obvious to modify Bradley et al. to linearly displace a shaft and mirror to change a view presented to an imaging device. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 1 under is in error and should be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to more fully capture the structure of FIGS. 1B and 1C, where the mirrored shaft includes two or more linearly separated mirrors that are diversely angled with respect to the aperture field of the imaging device so that linear displacement of the shaft along the axis of the shaft successively presents two or more different views to the imaging device as the diversely angled mirrors are brought into alignment with the aperture field of the imaging device. And the specification mentions at page 3, lines 6-19 both horizontal (i.e., radially perpendicular to the shaft) angulation and vertical (i.e., radially at an angle to the shaft) angulation. This arrangement is clearly not obviated by any combination of Bradley et al. and Hayakawa. Furthermore, with the claimed arrangement, the different views are well defined (i.e., minor variation in the linear position of the shaft will not affect the view presented to the imaging device), and (2) the angularity of the presented view can be vertical as well as horizontal.

Claims 2-7 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, and are patentable at least by virtue of such dependency. Newly added dependent Claim 6 recites that two or more mirror elements are horizontally angled with respect to said aperture field to define different horizontally angled views of the scene as the different diversely angled mirror elements are brought into alignment with the aperture field of said imaging device, and newly added dependent Claim 7 includes similar limitations in respect to horizontally angled mirrors.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn. Claims 1-7 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark A. Navarre', written over a horizontal line.

Mark A. Navarre, Attorney
Registration No. 29572
Telephone: (937) 653-3501